scription "S. A. Douglas, the solitary exception," meaning thereby that I was supposed to be the only man north of the Ohio river who was willing to stand by and carry out the Missouri compromise indefinitely westward through our entire pos essions. I was then as fieroely and bitterly denounced for my support of the Missouri compromise as I am now for my advocacy of self-govern-ment in lieu of it. I am charged with the enormous crime of inconsistency, in having supported that at one time which I have been instrumental in repealing at an-other. Well, if I have changed my action upon this point, I presume those who arraign me for it have also changed theirs, for when I supported the Missouri compromise they opposed it, and never became reconciled to it until I proposed its repeal as they had done six years before. [Laughter.] If I have changed, have they not also?

And the only point to be settled between us is simply this, which can give the best reasons for their course. I changed my action because their combined forces deprived me of the power to maintain and carry out the Missouri compromise: 1st. By voting it down in the House of Representatives; and, 2d. By the union of all resolutions of each of the compromise measures of 1850, distinctly referring to and describing each by name, and this moment, but the substance of which is distinctly impressed upon my mind. In those resolutions previously adopted instructing my colleague and myself to vote for a prohibition of slavery in all the newly-acquired territories of the United States. They also approved in those resolutions of each of the compromise measures of 1850, distinctly referring to and describing each by name, and contribute the Northern States. parties in the Northern States against it at the Presidenal election. These are my reasons for abandoning it. Now, what are their reasons for supporting a measure which they once declared infamous and caused to be abandoned? When, in 1849, their assaults rendered it necessary that I should speak at the State capital in vin-dication of my character and the motives of my support of the Missouri compromise, they denounced the compromise, the speech, and the sentiments and principles it contained as an abandonment of the claims of freedom and the rights of the North. These denunciations were kept up to the very hour that I brought forward the Nebraska bill, when suddenly, as if under the impulse of some powerful conviction, they stopped short in their ca-reer of denunciation, and, taking up this very measure against which they had exhausted all their powers of vituperation and abuse, embraced it "as a thing canonized in the hearts of the American people," and my speech its ablest vindication and defence, and containing the only orthodox principles in support of the sacred cause of freedom and in opposition to the aggressions of the slave

I repeat that the abandonment of the policy of settling the slavery question by a geographical line in the manner. I have stated produced all the excitement and agitation which ensued, and created the necessity for a new mode of adjustment. The country was suddenly plunged into a terrible sectional struggle. The North and the South were each made to believe that their respective rights were invaded, and that their honor and safety required them to marshal all their force in bostile array to repel the aggressions of the other. This struggle was continued until the wisest and best men in the country became tarmed for the safety of the Republic and the permanency of the Union. The venerable and immortal Clay, who had retired to the peaceful shades of Ashland for the purpose of preparing himself for another and a better sphere of existence, felt called upon to leave his retreat and again make his appearance in the Senate, the theater of the production of the senate, the theater of the senate of the tre of his usefulness, his triumphs, and his glory. From the moment of his appearance amongst us he ceased to be the gallant and resistless partisan leader of former

lays, and was now the representative of the patriotism Ind Union-loving sentiment of the country. He was hailed and recognised as the leader around whom all Union men, Whigs and Democrats, North and South, from all sections of the country, rallied as their champion in the glorious cause. During that session of Congress there were no Whigs and no Democrats as such in the partisan sense, but all were Union men, with sound constitutional views and national sentiments, in opposition to the fanatics and agitators whose measures, if not purpo ses, led directly to disunion and revolution. [Prolonged applause.]
With Clay as our leader and Cass and Webster as our

champions, the Union men struggled in that memorable session of ten months for the adoption of a great funda-mental principle as a rule of action, in all future times, in the organization of new Territories and the admission of new States. [Cheers.] It having been found impossible to adhere to and carry

the Missouri compromise, an imperative necessity exist-ed for the adoption of a principle just and constitutional, and alike applicable to every portion of our wide-spread country, which would not only furnish a satisfactory solution of existing difficulties, but in all future time avoid the occurrence of similar perils. What was this principle? The recognition on the part of the Federal Government of the right of every people to form and regulate their domestic concerns and internal policy in accordance with their own views, with no other limitation than that which the Constitution of the United States imposes.

The result of this principle was to guarantee to the copie of all new Territories and States coming into the Union the right, which it is believed the Constitution of the United States had already secured, but which the Missouri compromise had taken away, of determining the Missouri compromise had taken away, of determining the question of slavery for themselves, irrespective of their ocation north or south of any parallel of latitude. [Applause.] I will not weary you with a detail of the incidents attending that long seasion and with which the almost unanimous wish and sentiment of the people of Illinois as expressed in their resolutions. But, since such a violent crusade is now being waged against this ever, that for more than five months of that eventful period we assembled each day in the committee room, with every clay in the chair and Cass and Webster upon the right tion, and left, to consult what plan of operations could be adopted to thwart the mad schemes of the fanatics and onists, until the great principle for which we were contending should be carried and eventually triumph. That principle did triumph in the adoption of that system of measures known as the compromise of 1850. Cali-fornia was received into the Union with a constitution containing just such provisions upon the subject of slave-ary as her own people, when left free to decide for them-selves without any interference or dictation on the part of Congress, saw fit to adopt. [Applause.]

Utsh and New Mexico were organized with an express stipulation in their fundamental laws that said Territories, or any part of either of them, should be received on either with slavery or without, as their constitutions should prescribe at the time of admission. By locking into the boundaries of California, Utah, and New Mexico, it will be seen that this principle was applied to them without any reference to the line of 30° 30', or the source whence our fitle to the country was derived. That line cut California very nearly into equal parts, and yet the same principle was applied to the

whole country.

Although Utah is situated entirely north of 86° 80' ad embraced territory acquired from France under the consistent purchase to which the Missouri compromise lid apply, as well as territory acquired from Mexico, yet the compromise of 1850 guarantied to those people the right to decide the question of slavery for themselves in every portion of that territory, notwithstanding the Mis souri compromise denied them that right in a part, and the extension of it would have denied them the right in

New Mexico included large tracts of territory on both sides of the Missouri line, and was divided north and south by the Rio del Norte, embracing large districts acquired from Texas as well as from Mexico, together with a small tract which was originally a part of the Louisiana rchase. In so much of the country acquired from exas situated north of 26° 20' as was embraced within he limits of New Mexico, and upon which a prohibition of slavery had previously existed, there was a guaranty contained in the compromise of 1850 that the people should no longer be deprived of the right to settle the slavery question for themselves in any portion of said territory, notwithstanding the stipulation of the Mis-souri compromise that slavery should never exist therein. Thus it appears that in the adoption of the compromise of 1850 no respect was paid to the fact whether the territory lay north or south of 36° 30', or to whether it was from Mexico, Texas, or France, and whether slavery had been prohibited in any portion of it or not, or the reason that the principle upon which the new plan adjustment was founded rendered these considerations immaterial, since the policy of a geographical

entirely immaterial, sinc When I returned to my home in this city in October 1850, immediately after the consummation of this great the Presidency and placed him erect upon that platform, scheme of adjustment, I found here a wild and angry as containing the principles which he and they were to pirit of hostility and resistance to those measures, as riclent and as determined as that which existed to the Vebrasha bill on my return this year. I take no pleasure n recurring to the scenes that were then enacted. The Common Council had passed resolutions nullifying the aws of the United States, and withholding the assistance for the Presidency, and adopted a platform in which we of the police in their execution. The standard of rebel-ion against the Federal Government had been raised, and violent resistance to the constituted authorities was breatened. The dangers of bloodshed and civil war eemed imminent and almost unavoidable. It was not a leasant duty to appear before the inhabitants of a city his excited and determined and vindicate a series of ensures so unpopular and so odious, and where the curindication appeared hopeless. Yet duty impelled me to mke the effort. I defended each of the compromise teasures of 1850 in detail, and the whole as a system; a substance and principle, being founded on sound con-

itutional principles. [Applause.]
My speech on that occasion was published in pamphlet
orm and a large edition circulated throughout this State,
ad to some extent throughout the whole country. If by one will take the trouble to look into that speech as a lablished at the time he will perceive that I then gave the same exposition of the principles of that plan of adjusted that I now give in my justification of the New bill. It will be seen that I then and there defendently the compromise measures of 1850 upon the distinct tunderstanding of the Illinois Legislature, and I think I may safely assume that it was the understanding of both Whigs and Democrats throughout the country in the Presidential campaign of 1852, that the principle of the compromise of 1850 was to constitute a rule of action, and to be applied in all cases and under all direction, and to be applied in all cases and under all directions the Union should be left free to decide the ny one will take the trouble to look into that speech as ablished at the time he will perceive that I then gave

question of slavery for themselves. There was a general | paign of 1852 was, whether Pierce or Scott, the Demoquestion of slavery for themselves. There was a general election pending in this State at the time for members of Congress and Legislature. Pending that canvass the merits of the compromise, which had just been adopted, and the correctness of the principles on which it was founded, were freely and fully discussed before the people. When the Legislature assembled a few weeks thereafter the two Houses proceeded to reconsider the position which the State occupied on the slavery question in consequence of their previous action, and to take such steps as the new redirections. new policy inaugurated by the compromise measures of 1850 should render necessary on the part of this State. The Senate passed and the House concurred in a series of resolutions, which I regret to say I have not at my command this moment, but the substance of which is disand especially they endorsed and approved of the organization of the new Territories without the " Wilmot provise being attached to the same. These resolutions were intended and understood as being the firm and deliberate expression of the people of Illinois that this State, from that pe riod and in the future, would stand upon and approve the great principles upon which the compromise measures of 1850 were founded as a substitute for the obsolete theory of a geographical line to separate free from slave terri-

ory. [Cheers and great applause.]
In addition to this series of resolutions, the House of Reesentatives, who were the immediate representatives of the people, and all of whom had been elected pending the discussion of this question and with a view to the endorsement of the principle contained in it, adopted another series of resolutions, which should not only endorse the compromise measures of 1850 as a satisfactory adjustment of the points involved in that controversy, but should sanction the principles asserted as a rule of action to govern the Senators and Representatives from this State in all time to come. I will be pardoned for reading that resolution:

" Resolved, That our liberty and independence are based "Resolved, That our liberty and independence are based upon the right of the people to form for themselves such government as they may choose, and that this great privilege, the birthright of freemen, the gift of Heaven, secured to us by the blood of our ancestors ought to be extended to future generations; and no limitation ought to be applied to this power, in the organization of any territory of the United States, of either a Territorial government or State constitution, provided the government so established shall be republican, and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States." United States." This resolution, it must be borne in mind, was adopted

as one of a series expressive of the opinions of the people of Illinois through their representatives upon the right of the people to settle the slavery question for themselves, and as an act of approval of the principle contained in the compromise measures of 1850 as a substitute for both the Wilmot proviso and the policy of a geographical line. Thus it appears that at that period the representatives of the people of Illinois regarded the principle involved in the Nebraska bill as the "birthright of freenen, the gift of Heaven, secured to us by the blood of our ancestors," and declared that this principle "ought to be extended to future generations." In order to avoid all doubt as to their meaning in its application to territory either now possessed or hereafter acquired, they declared that " NO LIMITATION ought to be applied to this power in the organization of any territory of the United States. f either a Territorial government or State constitution. Why the necessity, after declaring this principle to be the birthright of freemen, to say that no limitation should be colerated upon the power? By the Missouri compromise the people of the Territories north of the parallel of 36° 30' were to be forever deprived of the right of exercising "this great privilege," either while a Territory or after their admission into the Union as States. Inasmuch as that line had been abandoned and this great principle substituted in lieu thereof, the representatives of the people of Illinois, evidently with express reference to this old Missouri restriction, declared in this resolution that out the policy of a geographical line as inaugurated by the Missouri compromise, an imperative necessity existorth or south of 36° 30', or whether in the territory now possessed or to be hereafter acquired. Could more clear and emphatic language have been devised for the expression of this intention on the part of the House of Representatives? This resolution is also in perfect harmony with those of the Senate to which I have referred, and only differs from them in being more distinct and explicit in the form of expression. By these resolutions my league and myself were peremptorily instructed, so far as it was competent for the representatives of the people to instruct, to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska upon the principle contained in the Nebraska bill, whenever said Territories should be organized. In pre-paring the bill, therefore, in the form in which it now plause.] I will not weary you with a detail of the incidents attending that long session and with which the country is familiar. I may be permitted to remark, howrecord before me, from which it will be perceived that very Democratic representative presen voted for this resolution in the form in which I have read it. Was it reasonable to have expected, after the Democratic party had thus approved of this principle by the unanimous vote of their representatives, that any De-mocrat should rise up and denounce me as a traitor for doing that which I had been recommended to do by the Democratic party of the whole State through their repesentatives? [Loud and repeated applause.) Now, let us see who voted against this resolution of instruction. Here are all the names: Adams, of Kane, Gage, of Mc-Henry, Norton, of Will, and Swan, of Lake, four in all: three Abolitionists and one Whig, who is now an Abolition and Know-Nothing member of Congress. Only four vetes in the whole House, and such votes! How is this? Were there no Whigs in the House? and, if so, how did they vote? Here are their names: Adams, of Whiteside, Allen, Arms, Beekman, Breckenridge, Bruer, Bristow, Edwards, of Madison, Emmerson, Hamilton, Hatch, Hodges, Knapp, Miller, of Madison, Miller, of Winnebago, Persinger, Pickering, Singleton, Thomas, Thornton. Were not these all Whigs good and true, and the only Whigs who represented the people of Illinois in the House at that time? Instructed by the unanimous vote of the Democratic party and the unanimous vote of the Whig party to allow "no limitation" upon the right ole of Kansas and Nebraska, or any other Territory, to settle the slavery question for themselves, I am now denounced as a traitor for my fidelity to that principle and my obedience to that instruction. Do not misunderstand me. I say now, what I have said everywhere in my speeches, that I do not offer this resolution of instruction as my reason for having incorporated this principle into the Nebraska bill. [Cheers.] I should have done so if I had not been instructed; I should have done so if the people of Illinois had never expressed any opinion upon the subject: I should have done so because the ciple is right in itself, is just to the people of the Territories and of the new States to be formed thereof, is consistent with the Constitution, and underlies our entire ystem of Republican Government. [Enthusiastic cheer-While I do not cite this resolution of instruction my reason for my fidelity to this great principle of self-government and constitutional right, I confess that it was a matter of satisfaction to me to know that while doing my duty I had the recorded evidence of the anproval of the two great political parties, embracing nine-tenths of the whole people of Illinois. [Applause.] The evidence that the Whig party as well as the Demo-

cratic party was solemnly pledged to sustain and carry out this principle does not stop here. One year after these legislative resolutions were adopted the two parties assembled at Baltimore to nominate their respective candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. The Whigs adopted a platform in which they pledged themselves to stand by and carry out the ompromise measures of 1850, as a final settlement of the slavery question "in substance and in principle They then nominated Gen. Scott as their candidate for the Presidency and placed him erect upon that platform, carry into effect in the event of his election. Gen. Scott accepted the nomination (to use his own language) with the resolutions annexed. The Democratic party assem-bled in National Convention at the same place, and about for the Presidency, and adopted a platform in which we also stood pledged to adhere to and carry out the compromise measures of 1850 as a final settlement of the slavery controversy. What did we all mean when we declared that compromise to be a final settlement in sub-stance and in principle? Did we allude to the past only and not to the future? Did we mean that in all that time there should never be another Territory.organized or a new State admitted into the Union? Surely we could not have meant that our immense territorial possessions should forever remain savage wildernesses. And if new Territories were to be formed, did we not all know that some Abolitionist would instantly propose the Wilmot proviso or the ordinance of 1787 against the right of the people to settle the slavery question? I repeat, then, what did we mean by that pledge unless it was that the prin-ciple was to be final and to be applied in all future time, whenever a new Territory was to be organized or a new State to be admitted? I have already shown that it was

adoption of the compromise measures of 1850. In order to understand distinctly the provisions of that act, and their bearing upon the present question, it is necessary to bear in mind that the Territory of Washington formerly constituted a part of the Territory of Oregon, and that Oregon was organized on the 14th of August, 1848, with a provision declaring the ordinance of 1787, for the pro-hibition of slavery, to be in force in the whole of that Territory. When the bill was presented to President Polk for his signature he hesitated about signing it, upon the ground of that slavery prohibition; but when he concluded to do so he accompanied his approval with a mes-sage to the House of Representatives, where the bill originated, in which he declared, in substance, that he signed the bill with the understanding that the Missouri line was to be extended to the Pacific, and because a prohibi-tion of slavery in Oregon would be consistent with the Missouri compromise if thus extended, the whole of that territory being north of 36° 30'. But he also said in the same message that he never would have approved of the bill containing that prohibition under any other circumstances than the confident expectation that the Missouri line was to be adhered to and carried out in the mode suggested. When, however, the Missouri line was d, and the great principle of self-government substituted for it by the compromise of 1850, the ques-tion naturally arose upon what plan the Territory of

Washington should be organized. By reference to the act it will be seen that the ordinance of 1787 prohibiting slavery in Oregon was omitted in the bill organizing Washington; and, as if to render the intention of the Legislature clear and certain, the 12th section of the bill provides what acts of Congress passed prior to that date should be in force, and omitting, and hereby excluding, the organic law of Oregon and the rdinance of 1787 from being longer in force in the Territory of Washington. Thus it appears that in the bill establishing the Territory of Washington, which was the first and only Territory created since the adoption of the compromise of 1850, and before the introduction of the Nebraska bill, the probibition of slavery was not only omitted, but a slavery prohibition, which had been for several years in force in the Territory, was absolutely recaled, and the people allowed to settle the slavery ques-ion for themselves, precisely as they are in Utah and New Mexico, under the compromise of 1850, and in Kansas and Nebraska under the act organizing those Territories. How does it happen that the tornado of virtuous ind gna-tion against the Nebraska bill, because the prohibition of was repealed in order to enable the people to govern themselves, was not raised against the Washing-ton bill, where a similar prohibition was repealed, under precisely the same circumstances? The journals show that the Washington bill passed the House by one hundred majority, and that nearly every Northern Whig voted for it, including the only Whig member from this State, (R. YATES,) and that it passed the Senate without a division; no one feeling disposed even to call the yeas and nays. Ten months after the Washington Territory was established I introduced the bill to organize the Teritories of Kausas and Nebraska; and, in order to carry out in good faith the principles of the compromise of 1850, a clause was introduced to render the old prohibition of slavery inoperative and void and to leave the peoole free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. Now, those who voted for and sustained

very material point. It has been said, and every where repeated in the non-Territory or out of any Territory. The law declares in his act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United

tates." [Applause.]
If the principle be right to allow the people to govern themselves in all that relates to their domestic and internal policy, then the Nebraska bill is right. If that prinple be wrong, the Nebraska bill is wrong. Why should not the people of Kansas and Nebraska be allowed to govern themselves? Are they not capable of self-govern-ment? Who are they and whence did they come from that they cannot be trusted with this sacred right? Did they not emigrate from Illinois and Kentucky, from Pennsylania and Virginia, and the other States of the Union Were they not capable of deciding this slavery question for themselves before they left their homes in the No one doubts that. If so, will it be contended that these people have lost their capacity to govern themselve simply because they have demonstrated their spirit and enterprise by moving a little further west in the grand narch of progress and civilization? . I repeat the question, then, why should they not be permitted to exercise privilege, which has been declared to be the birthright of freemen by our representatives in the Legislaare, and which I say they cannot be deprived of without being reduced to a condition of political bondage? [Ap plause. ] The Abolitionists admit their willingness to al low the people to exercise this right in all other matters except that of African slavery. Why make this excep-Their answer is, because slavery is a horrid crin If it is crime, is that the only crime that the people of a Cerritory and of the new States are called upon to provide against. Murder is supposed to be a crime, and rob-bery and larceny; yet I would be obliged to any man who will show me an act of Congress providing for the pun-shment of either in any organized Territory of the United States. Will it be said that Congress encourages and supports murder, and robbery, and largeny in the Terri-tories because, instead of establishing a criminal code for the people, they have granted them a Legislature, and left the people free to make their own laws and to form their own criminal code, through their own representa-tives, elected for that purpose? They tell us that slavery evil that the people of the Territories are called protect themselves against? I know many good and true men who believe that the use and abuse, manufacture and sale of ardent spirits is a grievous evil, injurious to the morals of the community; but I have never known any one of them to petition Congress for the passage of a fur damental and irrevocable law that brandy should never be used or introduced into any Territory of the United States or into any State hereafter to be formed there Nor have I ever known them to petition Congress n favor of a geographical line across the continent, tole-rating liquor on one side and forever prohibiting it on the other. Our temperance friends understand the Constiution and the principles of our Government too well to call upon Congress to legislate upon matters so purely of a local and domestic character. When they desire to exert their energies for the suppression of the evils of in- | tion of slaves, and provision made for protecting and entemperance they are in the habit of applying to the Le- forcing the rights of the master. Under the the passage of all needful laws for the preservation of the ing Territory, and remained such until after Congress, blic morals. Why cannot the Abolitionists learn the rue theory of our Government from the friends of temrance, and trust to the people of each State and Terriry to make whatever laws are necessary for the public any other limitation norals and for the suppression of crime? They tell us Federal Constitution, and being left entirely free to form and the rights of the negro are too secred to be consided and regulate their domestic institutions to suit them. that the rights of the to the uncertain and perilous protection of the people of a seives, determined in their State Constitution, 1st. That Territory. Are they any more sacred than the rights of all persons owing service or labor in the State should ful-the white men? They do not object to giving the Legis-fil the period of service; 2d. That no more slaves should latures of the Territories unlimited control over all the rights and interests of white people, subject to no other after born of slave parents should become free at a spe limitation than that which the Constitution imposes.

They are willing to allow the Legislature to prescribe and regulate the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, but they are shocked at the idea of permitting them to establish the relations of master and servant. Do they egard the rights of the negro as any more sacred than the rights of their wives and children that they require a higher degree of civilization to protect the latter than the former? Why, then, shall we not trust the people of the Territories to legislate for the negro as well as the

paign of 1852 was, whether Pierce or Scott, the Democratic or Whig party, would prove the most reliable in carrying out the principles of the compromise measures of 1850. I remember that I gave offence to some of my high friends by intimating in my spechese that the Whig. Principle are sure to inflict it upon that question; but the promptly and their candidate, notwithstanding their place. The objection of allowing the people are sure to inflict it upon that question; but the promptly and their candidate, notwithstanding their place. The objection to allowing the people to make their own they promptly and with some certrify retorded upon me that those measures were Whig measures, predicated upon which the promptly and their promptly and their promptly and with some exertity retorded upon me that those measures were Whig measures, predicated upon which the promptly and their own that those measures were Whig measures, predicated upon which the promptly and the promptly and their own that those measures were Whig measures, predicated upon they promptly and their own that the promptly and the promptly and their own that those measures were while measures were while the power of the power of the promptly and the pr who are to be affected by those laws any vote or voice in the law-making power. Where did they derive that printed ciple? George III. and the Tories of the Revolution States. By reference to the laws enacted by the people dear to them in the party, and therefore may be relied. claimed that the American Colonies, in matters affecting of Oregon under the provisional government it will be upon as being pure and unadultarated Abolitionists in their domestic affairs and internal concerns, should be seen that they had prohibited slavery in that Territory the future. I fear, from my observations in this State for governed by laws made by the British Parliament, without giving the Colonies any voice or representation in its jurisdiction over it by establishing a Territorial govout giving the Colonies any voice or representation in its jurisdiction over it by establishing a Territorial govnight time by the abolition army and all taken prisoners.

At the time, therefore, that Congress extend-Parliament. Our revolutionary fathers, while they were willing to acknowledge their allegiance to the imperial Government in all things which related to foreign affairs and imperial concern, denied the right of the Parliament, or of any other power on earth, to make laws for them affecting their persons or property without their consent, freely given by representatives elected by themselves. The denial of this right by the British Government to the most substantial and authoritative evidence that they had given the most substantial and authoritative evidence that they have it. the American Colonies produced the revolution which resulted in the establishment of our independence. Every battle of that seven years' bloody struggle was fought in casions, that this abolition doctrine of Congressional inresulted in the estatonsment of our inappearance but the casions, that this abolition doctrine of Congressional interference in the casions, that this abolition doctrine of Congressional interference is the Constitution of the Congressional interference has never succeeded in driving slavery from the casions, that this abolition doctrine of Congressional interference is invariable as the Constitution of the Congressional interference in the casions, that this abolition doctrine of Congressional interference is invariable as the Congressional interference in the Congression in the of preserving and maintaining the rights achieved by the Revolution. The question now arises, shall the Congress of the United States enforce upon the people of the Territories a principle so odious that the signers of the Designer of the Designer of the Designer of the United States and the signers of the Designer o claration of Independence pledged to its resistance "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors?" We stand

tution of the United States was adopted for the purpose now where the patriots of the Revolution then stood, claiming for the people of distant territories or colonies the right of self-government in all things pertaining to their local and internal concerns. Our opponents stand where the Tories of the Revolution stood, denying that right and claiming all power over them, upon the pretence that they are incapable of protecting themselves against the injurious consequences of their own acts. The Abo-litionists seek to excuse themselves for this flagrant violation of the sacred right of self-government upon the ground that the people of the Territories and new States | road to popular favor and to the highest political honors. or a sister in the Southern States? will certainly open the door to the introduction of slavery. If this assertion should prove true it will not be pretended that any free man would thereby be deprived liberty, or that the number of slaves in the United States would be increased by the removal of a portion of those on the east side of the Mississippi to the country on the and no one else. If the people want them to come and does the history of the country sustain the position asof '87.

that day; yet, in the face of these facts and in contempt | this sectional strife be continued? Territories had proved true instead of false. Where, then, are the beneficial results of their abolition doctrine From what foot of American soil have they drawn slavery by not of Congress? When the Constitution was adopted

finance of 1787, or the Missouri restriction ? Slavery was abolished in New Hampshire, Rhode Island,

lomestic institutions in their own way.

Where, then, are the triumphs of the Congressional interference and dictation? The Abolitionist points to the To exclude slavery from all the Territories over which free institutions in Illinois and the other States formed the General Government has exclusive jurisdiction; 6th from the old Northwest Territory, and attributes these to To resist the acquisition of any more Territories unless the ordinance of '87 prohibiting slavery. Is it true that slavery therein shall be forever prohibited. these States rejected slavery merely because of an obsolete ordinance, which, Mr. Madison Informs us, was originally | this new party "will support no man for office under the passed without constitutional authority, and which the General or State Government who is not positively com-Supreme Court of the United States has decided to have mitted to the support of these principles, and whose perhow happens it that the people of these States, when re- | reliable, and shall abjure all old party ties and obligations. lieved from the operation of that ordinance by being received into the Union upon an equality with the original Will it be contended that States, did not adopt slavery? Illinois and each ether State formed out of the North-western Territory has not the same right to establish or erats and Whigs who have been faithful to their princi abolish, introduce or exclude slavery that Virginia or ples and who conscientiously believe what they profess Massachusetts has under the Constitution? I do not recognise the doctrine that there can be inequality in remove them to change their sld names? Honest spect to the rights and powers of the different States in men seldom change their names. There is another class this Confederacy. Each State is an absolute sovereignty who frequently find it politic to do so. I am sure that no in all things where the Constitution of the United States Democrat who has been true to his faith and to his daily has not imposed limitations, and whatever limitations has discovered any reason for being asharaed of the is an evil, affecting injuriously the morals of both the that instrument has placed upon any of the States applies name, and I would regret to learn that any white and the black. If it be so, is it the only moral with equal force to each of all the States, old and new, was a faithful disciple of Clay and Webster west that instrument has placed upon any of the States applies name, and I would regret to learn that any Whis who slaveholding and non-slaveholding. Nor is it competent to disown either the name or the faith so soon after these for Congress or any other power, so long as the Consti- great champions of their cause had been consigned to the tution remains unchanged, to impose a limitation, either | tomb. But, while names are only important as designatby the name of the Wilmot provise, or the ordinance of 7, or the Hissouri restriction, or by any other name, the attention of Whige and Demograts to this new politic pon any new State either now in the Union or hereafter cal creed. The first thing which strikes us as remarka on any new State either now in the Union or hereafter to be admitted which the Constitution has not placed upon all the States. Hence I insist that the true and aly reason why slavery does not exist in Illinois is because the people do not want it, and consequently have prohibited it. Nor is it historically true that slavery did not exist or was not introduced into Illinois while a Territory and under the restrictions of the ordinance of '87 By reference to the code of Territorial laws adopted a Vincounce in 1807 by the Legislature of the Territory, i will be seen that the door was opened for the intro latures of the States and Territories where they live for and protection of those laws Illinois became a slavehold-1818, passed a law for her admission into the Union on an equality with the original States in all respects whatso-Then the people of Illinois, being released from these facts it appears that so long as Congress said that the people of Illinois should not have slavery, just so long they did and would have it; but the moment that Con-gressional interference was withdrawn and the great principle of self-government, as recognised in the Nebras-ka bill, was extended to our people as a matter of right,

Is it not notorious that at the time that this abolition fanaticism at the North commenced its warfare upon the party, animated by high hopes of success, in Virginia, Maryland. Kentucky, and Delaware, advocating the same line of policy there in favor of a gradual system of emansylvania, New York, and the Eastern States? Then to What has produced the change? Go to those eminent and now venerable statesmen, or so many of them as still of his survive, and ask them why it was that they failed in these great efforts that gave them all their renown, and how it

happens now that they dare not, with a due regard to the safety of the communities in which they live, give the is nothing in the result of the recent elections which west of that noble stream. The only question is, whether a slightest countenance, much less active support, to those a should dampen our ardor or induce us to relax our energy as there remain with his master as such, or be compelled to remain in a state of slavery where he now is. The questions, and you will receive the same and the result of the recent elections which their fame is identified and for the success of which their highest aspirations are connected?

Ask those questions, and you will receive the same and result of a coalition between incongruous and irreconcilation. tion whenever slaves should be permitted to go into a swer which I have often received from their lips; that ble elements which cannot long be held together in harmonious action. If the received of a Territory, they would certainly have succeeded in establishing a monious action. If they would receive the same and process gradual system of emancipation years ago but for the reside among them, who has a right to interpose? But ganization of the abolition societies in the North and the erection of a powerful sectional party, with the avowed sumed, that, whether the people of any State or Terri- object of making a fierce and indiscriminate wer upon they are sure to decide in favor of the introduction of longed. When it became a warfare of section against sectory. [Applause ] slaves? The same class of men who now hold the affirmative of this proposition asserted in 1848 that unless Congress interposed and deprived the people of California of the right to decide this question for themselves she would become a slave State. We were then called upon to violate the great principle of self-government upon the ground that slavery would overrun California and New Mexico, and all the territory acquired by the treaty of strong instinct of self-preservation and by all those hely peace with Mexico, unless Congress should prohibit it by impulses which identified them with their brethren of the gitive slave law, to abolish slavery in the District of Co the adoption of the Wilmot proviso or the ordinance of Southern States, to make common cause in resisting a lumbia, and to prohibit the slave trade between the of '87.

States? Or, in order to retain the co-operation of the They succeeded in operating upon the prejudices and wait until that was accomplished before they should allow Know Nothing cabal, will they abolish the naturalization the Washington bill are the loudest and the fiercest in their denunciations of the Nebraska bill, when the two measures carry out precisely the same principle, in a difin favor of the positive prohibition of slavery. Has the Each year that this Northern agitation has been continwords, under circumstances identical in result sustained these predictions? Congress did not ued, and in proportion as its power and its violence have adopt the Wilmot proviso; did not impose a prohibition increased, the people of those States have become more I now come to the consideration of those provisions of the Nebraska bill which have been most fiercely assailed. of California, when left perfectly free to do as they pleased, | ever quarter and at whatever lazard; and, if we are perslaveholding States, that it was the intention and legal formed a constitution prohibiting the introduction of mitted to judge of the future from the history of the effect of the measure to extend slavery and to legislate it slaves. California, therefore, became a free State, not at past, there is no hope that the condition of the slave can into territory now free. It is certain that those who make the bidding or by the dictation of Congress, but under the be ameliorated so long as this sectional strife continues, this charge have never read the bill or comprehended its principles; otherwise they stand convicted by the law itself of stating that which is expressly contradicted by was applied to them, and they were left free to decide the knowledge the right of the people of each State and Terself of stating that which is expressly contradicted by the terms of the act. It would be a positive violation of the meselves. Have they established the principles of the Nebraska bill either for Congress to the Ne to establish or abolish it; either to legislate it into any gatived every proposition urged by the Abolitionists at Government or any other earthly power. Why should the 14th section: "It being the true intent and meaning of of past experience, they come forward now with the same from it either to the North or South, to the white or theories and predictions, sustained by the same argu- black? Its fruits thus far have been unmitigated evil, ments, and urged with as much assurance and apparent | without one redeeming result over which the philanthrozeal as if what they had predicted of California and the | pist or patriot has any reason to rejoice; and yet the concentrated effort is now being made throughout the non-slaveholding States to dissolve the two great political parwhich calls upon Congress to relieve the people from evils | ties heretofore existing and in their stead to organize a which they are supposed to be incapable of averting? new party-a great Northern Abolition party-whose every principle breathes hostility to the constitutional rights of one-half of the States of this Union. This new party, Union consisted of twelve slaveholding States and one although christened by its advocates with the name Re non-slaveholding State. Since that time slavery has been publican, its principles, as contained in the resolutions, abelished in six out of those twelve slaveholding States. Its conventions, and all other authoritative expositions of Was this accomplished by act of Congress, or through the its creed, are essentially abolition. I have before me the mysterious instrumentality of the Wilmot proviso, or the creed of this new party, to which every Fusion or Republican candidate throughout the whole North has been re-quired to give in his adherence as a condition of support. Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey It provides, first, that the Missouri restriction or the Wil-under the operation of the principles of the Nebraska bill, mot provise shall be restored to Kansas and Nebraska; which, under the Constitution of the United States, leave | 2d. For the repeal and entire abrogation of the fagitive the people of each State free to form and regulate their slave law: 3d. To restrict slavery, by act of Congress, to

> These articles of faith are followed by a resolution that ome void when the Constitution was adopted? If so, sonal character and conduct is not a guaranty that he is These are the conditions upon which Whigs and Demo erats are invited to abandon their old party organization and principles and to join the Abelitionists, ing substantial things, it may not be improper to invite ble is that each plank in the platform is sectional and not national. No man can embrace any one of the propositions in the North and carry it one mile south of the main channel of the Ohio river. Each proposition breathes dead y hostility to the South and to tions; each proposition discloses the deliberate purpose make war upon the institutions of one half of the States of the Union, in utter disregard of the Constitution of the United States. When did either of these propositions become an article of faith, either in the Whig or Democratic creed? By the Baltimore platform of '52, as I have had occasion to remark, the Whig party as well as the Democratic party solemnly pledged itself to stand and carry out in good faith the compromise measure of 1850 in substance and in principle. Was not the Will all of which had been adjusted in the provisions of a of Congress in the Territories abandoned in that compro-mise, and in lieu of it the right of self-government, subect to the Constitution, substituted? Was not the fug-ive slave law one of Mr. Clay's compromise measures of 500, to which both parties were pledged in 1852? How loes it happen that not two years ago no man could be a Whig, no man could be a Remocrat and be in good standwith his party as professing orthodox principles, uness he was in favor of carrying out that provision of the Constitution, and the laws in aid of it, which provides for the rendition of fugitives from labor? And now Whigs and Democrats are called upon to make a fusion with Abolitionists on the express condition that this provision of the Constitution and the laws enacted in obedience to

it shall be repealed and entirely abrogated. Did not the compromise measures of 1850 declare in so many words

part of either of them, should be received into the Union either with slavery or without, as their respective constitutions should prescribe at the time of admission?

that the Territories of Utah and New

tution has retired and yielded to other institutions, it has been done in every instance under the quiet and peace-ful operation of that great principle of our Government dices of the North to a war of deadly hostility and exterselves. Where are to be found the numerous and philanthropic results of this abolition agitation? Is it in the improved condition of the slave in the Southern States? stitution guaranties to them, but denies all obligation to observe or obey its mandates where it affords protection domestic institutions of the South there was a powerful to the institutions and rights of one-half of the States party, animated by high hopes of success, in Virginia, composing this Republic? Why should any patriotic citizen engage in the cruss le of the North against the South? How much will philanthropy, or humanity, or constitucipation which had been recently consummated in Penn- tional liberty gain if the war should be successful? Is sylvania, New York, and the Eastern States? Then to there no man nere whose heart beats in daison advocate emancipation in some portions of the Old Dominion and in several other States was the most direct here which throbs for the fate or happiness of a mether read to popular favor and to the highest political honors. there no man here whose heart beats in unison with a memories, no glories which we all hold in common and cherish with a devotion equally pure and holy, withe reference to the State that gave us birth or in the vicissitudes of fortune has become our home ? [Loud applause.]

> monious action. [Cheers.]
>
> It is an invariable law of political action that coalitions, when once successful, cannot hold together in the pext succeeding campaign. Hostile factions, like allied armies, by act in concert in the face of a common foe, but they

> tory. [Applause ]
> Thus it will be in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and laws and proscribe a large portion of the American people because of religious faith or their place of birth ! Never! They dare not!

Hence, my friends, let us be of good cheer; all is well. Though the heavens are partially overcast, the clouds are passing away. The prospect of a glorious day was never brighter. [Cheers.] Let us stand firm by our princi-ples; they are the principles of the Constitution, of the Union, of that great Democratic party which has so long controlled the destinies of the nation, which has conducted us to a position of greatness and power that challenges the admiration of every enlightened people, and which cannot be abandoned without destroying the last hope of world. [Applause.] Let there be no compromises with [Applause.] Let us unfurl our banner to the battle and breeze, having inscribed upon its ample folds "The Constitution and the Union, State rights and the right of the People to self-government, perfect religious toleration, and no proscription of American citizens wherever torn, and no proscription of American citizens wherever born. [Cheers of applause.] Let it float proudly amidst the raging storms, for they will be as brief as furious. They may beat against the Rock of Democracy on which that ensign is planted, but it will not be moved. Leng after the agitated waters have subsided it will stand out in its invincibility, and no man need fear for the ship of State while it is anchored to its everlasting base. [Le and long-continued cheering. ]

## THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICA

The annexed letter, which we find copied into the Inion, being on international matters, it is due to our Minister to Mexico, as well as to our relations with Mexico, that we place it in our columns:

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES. MEXICO, NOVEMBER 4, 1854. DEAR SIR: I read with no little mortification the repubication of an article in your journal, from a Texas paper, needed "Another Outrage in Mexico." The painful disclosure of "three American citizens confined for four cars in a stone and filthy dungeon," and tortured without trial or legal condemnation, coupled with the public appeal, "for the sake of humanity let there be something done in the matter. If a citizen of the United States has any protection abroad let it be known. For what object do we have a Minister in Mexico?" comes through a journal from the native city of this Legation that makes the reproof the more painful.

It is true the statement of the aggrieved parties " having at several times written letters to the American Minister at Mexico," is qualified with the charitable apology "that it is supposed that he has never received The highly respected gentlemen from Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee had their sympa-thies very properly excited at seenes of protracted suffer-ings which they were permitted to witness. When at Durango, however, and where there is no Consul or United States agent to watch over American interests, fthe stance from the capital not exceeding two hundred and fifty miles,) a communication direct to the Minister uld have commanded carrier attention and relief than intelligence (conveying reproof) through circuitous and uncertain public channels, which accidentally found a piace in the columns of one of the journals received at his Legation.

It was fortunate in this respect, as it detailed comlaints of the "rude hand of violence" towards American itizens where it was most important it should be known. There has been no time, therefore, lost in instituting an quiry into the statements of personal outrage detailed in the Evening News; and, as most opportunely, there is an American citizen of respectability and character engaged in business at Durango, this Legation has availed itself of his services to secure a thorough investigation of the causes of arrest and of the cruel penalties in flicted. There need be no alarm or appreh the pledges of the inaugural will not be redsemed to the

full measure of reclamation by this Legation.

In justice to those, however, who have preceded the present incambent in the responsibilities of the Mexican mission, it ought to be said that, on a ponderous docket treaty which the rejection by the Senate has ill-advisedly reopened for unpleasant litigation, the cutrageous pro-ocedings against Shirley, Rodgers, and Gaines are not noted. The records in the office expose no correspondence on the subject, nor are there any just grounds for the belief that any letters addressed on the subject of griesances by American citizens have either been neglected of

Whatever may be the intimations of violations of seals aring the periods of distrust and alarm, the mails, from the experience of the undersigned, have been conducted with regularity and punctuality, and the suspicions of the abominations intimated arise from the external break-age of the wax or wafers. The correspondence of this Legation throughout Mexico has not been seriously inter-rupted. Official letters to the Rio Graude have been regularly acknowledged; though, since the disturbances in that quarter, public agents have complained that they have not enjoyed the privilege of the first perusal.

Respectfully, JAMES GADSDEN.

Colonel CUNNINGHAM, Editor of the Charleston News.